



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/821,051

04/08/2004

William Bornstein

AUS920030782US1(4039)

9655

45557

7590

08/30/2010

IBM CORPORATION (JSS)
C/O SCHUBERT LAW GROUP PLLC
6013 CANNON MOUNTAIN DRIVE, S14
AUSTIN, TX 78749

EXAMINER

LAN, TZU-HSIANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/30/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/821,051	Applicant(s) BORNSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

The following is a Final Office Action in response to the communications received on June 9, 2010. Claims 1-28 are now pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/9/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Guinta and Prather fail to teach the limitation "within a controlled environment" recited in the preamble, examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, the recitation "within a controlled environment" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Here, processes for improving audit as recited in the body of the claim are able to stand alone without relying on intended field of use i.e. within a controlled environment.

Secondly, in col.1 lines 14-50, Guinta explicitly teaches improving audit within a controlled environment such as in-house department and system.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Guinta and Prather fail to teach the limitation "an integrated portable processing device is adapted for operation within the controlled environment consisting of a clean room", examiner respectfully disagrees.

While Guinta fails to explicitly teaches a portal processing device for improving audit in a controlled environment, Prather cures the deficiency by using an integrated portable processing device adapted for operation within the controlled environment consisting of a clean room (see at least figure 8 and ¶¶35-38. i.e. hand-held auditing computer can operated as an integrated portable process device adapted for operating in a clean room).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather because using integrated portable device to perform on-site auditing can facilitate instant audit data access or upload via a portable device.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Guinta and Prather fail to teach the limitation "a quality issue ... associated with a product" and "group of questions associated with the quality issue", examiner respectfully disagrees.

Here, Guinta teaches a quality issue based upon a system product for a particular company see col. 5:51-65 i.e. an organizational system. Guinta's auditing method primarily directing towards an organization's process, in a broadest reasonable interpretation, organizational service/process is also a form of product that can be audited based on Guinta disclosure. Prather is further provided to teach more narrow interpretation for this limitation. In ¶¶27-29 and figures 5-9, Prather explicitly teaches auditing an insurance product based upon its quality issue using a group of quality related questions i.e. coverage and pricing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather because both prior arts are analogous in auditing product based on question surveys. Moreover, since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guinta in view of US patent publication 2005/0033617 to Prather et al. ("Prather")

As to claim 1, Guinta discloses invention substantially including a method for improving an audit within a controlled environment (Guinta, col.1 lines 14-50), the method comprising:

determining a quality issue to address, the quality issue being associated with a product, wherein the product is the subject of the audit (Guinta, col. 1 lines 40-50 i.e. engine quality to minimize engine defect, chart 1 shows plurality of quality issues associate with a product i.e. system);

selecting a group of questions associated with the quality issue (Guinta, table 1 i.e. different group of questions associated with system quality);

posing, on the interactive interface, a question of the group of questions to gather information related to evaluation of the quality issue (Guinta, Fig 5a-5e and col. 17 lines 12-65 i.e. it shows an interactive interface for posting question to an user that is running on a processing device);

determining a sub-group of the group of questions, the sub-group being selected based upon an association with the information received in response to the question (Guinta, col.16 line 54 – col.17 line 21); and

storing the information (Guinta, Fig 1-3, i.e. last step corresponds to saving data or storing the information).

While Guinta teaches all the limitations above, Guinta fail to explicitly teach the following limitations, however, Prather teaches:

a integrated portable processing device having an interactive interface adapted for operation within the controlled environment consists of a clean room (figure 8 i.e. hand-held auditing computer capable to present interface to user as shown in figure 10-12. Further it is able to communicate with database and server for storing and retrieving information); and

memory removably integrated into the integrated portable device (figure 8 and ¶ 37 i.e. computer server memory removably integrated with hand-held portable device).

Prather further teaches narrower interpretation for quality issue associated with a product (¶ 27-29 i.e. quality issue associated with insurance product).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather because both prior arts are analogous in auditing product based on quality question surveys. Further, since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 2, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta further discloses processing the information along with other information related to the group of questions to evaluate performance related to the quality issue (col. 17 lines 21-37, and Fig 5a-e i.e. process selected first indication with second indication to the group of questions to evaluate performance).

As to claim 3, see the discussion in claim 2 above. Guinta further discloses generating a report based upon the information to describe the performance (col. 18 lines 43 – col. 20 and table 2).

As to claim 4, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta does not explicitly disclose interacting with a user to select the quality issue. However, Prather discloses interacting with a user to select the quality issue (Fig 12, and ¶ 42-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 5, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta does not explicitly disclose selecting a quality issue based upon the product. However Prather discloses

Art Unit: 3623

selecting a quality issue based upon the product (Prather, fig 14-15, and ¶ 51-55 i.e. select quality issue based upon product).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 6, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta does not explicitly disclose searching a database for question. However Prather discloses searching a database for questions having an association with the quality issue (¶ 49-53, and Fig 10-12 i.e. looking into related question database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 7, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta further discloses a relationship table for associations with the quality issue (table 1). However, Guinta does not disclose searching function to access the database. Prather discloses searching a database for information (¶ 49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather because ability to search relationship database would reduce information retrieval time.

As to claim 8, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta further displaying the question and a set of potential answers on a monitor (Fig 4 and 5). However, Guinta does not disclose displaying materials on a touch screen display of a personal digital assistant. However, official notice is taken that it was old and well known at the time of the invention to display information on a touch screen display of a personal digital assistant. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display auditing system on a touch screen display of a personal digital assistant because it provides more convenient information access.

As to claim 9, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Guinta further discloses selecting the sub-group for the audit in light of the information (Fig. 1-3 and col.6 line 42—line 34 i.e. demonstrable system and extent of deployment). However, Guinta does not explicitly disclose that sub-group is selected based upon relevancy of questions. Guinta further discloses sub-group of relevant questions in table 1 such as topics under different quality concerns.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify sub-group questions based on relevancy of questions because this would optimize drill down audit questionnaire to inquire relevant features of a product.

As to claim 10, Guinta and Prather disclose the claimed invention substantially.

All the limitations of claim 10 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 1, and are therefore rejected on the same basis, with following noted exceptions. Claim 10 recites narrowing the group of questions to a sub-group of the group based upon the response to the question.

Here Guinta further teaches:

narrowing the group of questions to a sub-group of the group based upon the response to the question, wherein the sub-group of questions are relevant to a quality issue of a product in light of the response (Fig. 1-3 and col.6 line 42—line 34 i.e. demonstrable system and extent of deployment where sub-group questions are relevant to a quality issues; **notice** that in figure 1, and 2 last node leads to more questions to assess, and in table 1, especially col. 12 under 4.13 Guinta shows narrowing question labels for the system to process in tree-like survey structure. For instance, under 4.13 - control of nonconforming products, there are sub questions such as 4.13.1, 4.13.2 and 4.13.3); and

storing the response for analysis (Guinta, Fig 1-3, i.e. last step corresponds to saving data or storing the information, and table 2 for analysis).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 11, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Guinta further discloses processing the response along with other responses related to the group of questions to analyze performance with respect to the quality issue (table 2, and col. 18 line 43 – col. 20).

As to claim 12, see the discussion in claim 11 above. Guinta further discloses generating a report based upon the responses to describe the performance (col. 18 lines 43 – col. 20 and table 2).

As to claim 13, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Guinta further discloses displaying a question for the audit related to the quality issue on a display adapted for operation within a controlled environment (Fig. 4-5).

As to claim 14, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Guinta further discloses identifying questions based upon the response (Fig. 1-3 and col.6 line 42—line 34 i.e. demonstrable system and extent of deployment).

As to claim 15, Guinta discloses an apparatus to improve an audit, the apparatus comprising:

A processing device (fig. 4 col. 17 line 38-45)

an interactive interface, associated with the processing device for use within a controlled environment (col.17 line 47-58 Fig 5a-e) to invoke a response to a question

Art Unit: 3623

from a group of questions associated with the audit and to narrow the group to a sub-group based upon the response to the question, wherein the sub-group is relevant to a quality issue of a product in light of the response (Fig 1-3, narrow the question based upon response; see discussion in claim 10); and

group of questions are invoked in an order based upon the response (Fig 1-3);

While Guinta discloses all the limitations above, Guinta does not explicitly teach the following limitations, however, Prather discloses:

An integrated portable processing device having an interactive interface adapted for operation within the controlled environment consists of a clean room (figure 8);

a question database coupled with the interactive interface (§ 29 and Fig. 2-3, 12), the question database having the group of questions (Fig 12 option to view all questions).

an audit database coupled with the interactive interface, to store data, wherein the data represents the response and responses to other questions from the group (§ 86-88 and fig. 7-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 16, see the discussion in claim 15 above. Guinta does not explicitly show an audit analyzer coupled with the audit database. However, Prather further discloses:

an audit analyzer coupled with the audit database to analyze the data to evaluate performance related to the quality issue and to generate a report communicate the evaluation (fig 8, i.e. auditing database coupled to auditing server to analyze the data to evaluate performance related to quality issue in fig. 5 and report in fig. 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 17, see the discussion in claim 15 above. Guinta further disclose a relationship table (table 1) coupled with the interactive interface (Fig. 5) to describe associations between the quality issue and responses to questions of the group of questions (table 2).

As to claim 18, see the discussion in claim 15 above. Guinta further disclose a graphical user interface for a display adapted for use within a controlled environment, to interact with a user (Figure 5).

As to claim 19, see the discussion in claim 15 above. Guinta does not explicitly disclose that the question database comprises questions determined by an experienced auditor. However, Prather discloses:

Question database comprises questions determined by an experienced auditor (¶ 39-42 i.e. prepared by experts).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather because having questions determined by an experience auditor would provide standard quality audit and reduce human variability (Prather, ¶ 3-6)

As to claim 20, see the discussion in claim 19 above. Guinta further disclose that question database comprises answers to the questions (fig. 1-3, and col.6 line 42 - col.7 line 34 i.e. question database comprise scale answer and “yes” or “no” answer), but Guinta does not disclose the answers are determined by experienced auditor. However, Prather discloses:

Answers are determined by an experienced auditor (Fig. 5, and ¶ 39-42 i.e. weight score and possible answers in already created question bank).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Guinta with Prather because having answers determined by an experience auditor would provide standard quality audit and reduce human variability (Prather, ¶ 3-6).

Art Unit: 3623

Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guinta in view Prather and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,472 B1 to Danneels et al. ("Danneels").

As to claim 21, Guinta discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 1 above. Guinta does not explicitly teach providing all these executable instructions on a computer-readable medium, although it is strongly suggested by Das in col.17 lines 38-47 i.e. memory. Danneels et al., teaches a computer-implemented method realized as one or more programs on a computer (see column 2, lines 40-46 of Danneels et al.) In addition, Danneels et al. teaches that the programs are storable on a machine-accessible storage medium such as a floppy disk or a CD-ROM (see column 2, lines 46-49 of Danneels et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Guinta discussed in claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of distribution and installation and execution of the software on another computer (see column 7, lines 46-49 of Danneels et al.).

As to claim 22, see the discussion in claim 21 above. All the limitations of claim 22 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 2 in combination with claim 3, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results

Art Unit: 3623

of the combination were predictable. Therefore limitations of claim 22 are rejected on the same basis as claims 2-3, and the combination is rendered obvious.

As to claim 23, see the discussion in claim 21 above. All the limitations of claim 23 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 5 above, and therefore rejected on the same basis.

As to claim 24, see the discussion in claim 21 above. All the limitations of claim 24 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 6 above, and therefore rejected on the same basis.

As to claim 25, see the discussion in claim 21 above. All the limitations of claim 25 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 9 above, and therefore rejected on the same basis.

As to claim 26, Guinta discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 10 above. Guinta does not explicitly teach providing all these executable instructions on a computer-readable medium, although it is strongly suggested by Das in col.17 lines 38-47 i.e. memory. Danneels et al., teaches a computer-implemented method realized as one or more programs on a computer (see column 2, lines 40-46 of Danneels et al.) In addition, Danneels et al. teaches that the programs are storable on a computer-readable medium such as a floppy disk or a CD-

Art Unit: 3623

ROM (see column 2, lines 46-49 of Danneels et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Guinta discussed in claim 10. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of distribution and installation and execution of the software on another computer (see column 7, lines 46-49 of Danneels et al.).

As to claim 27, see the discussion in claim 26 above. All the limitations of claim 27 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 11 in combination with claim 12, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Therefore limitations of claim 22 are rejected on the same basis as claims 11-12, and the combination is rendered obvious.

As to claim 28, see the discussion in claim 26 above. All the limitations of claim 28 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 13 above, and therefore rejected on the same basis.

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN whose telephone number is (571)270-7054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth V. Boswell can be reached on (571)272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623